

Appl. No. 10/085,669

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of 25 March 2004. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application, Claims 12-20 have been withdrawn from consideration, Claims 1-4, 6 and 9-11 have been rejected, and Claims 5, 7, and 8 have been objected to.

By this amendment, withdrawn Claims 12-20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; Claims 2, 5, and 10-11 have been cancelled, Claims 1, 3, and 7-8 have been amended; and new Claims 21-25 have been added.

No new matter has been added.

In view of the remarks below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and further examination.

About The Invention

The present invention relates generally to arrangements including RF components, shields, and antennas. The present invention relates more particularly, to arrangements wherein a semiconductor device is disposed upon a substrate, and both a shield and an antenna are disposed above the semiconductor device, and in a spaced apart relationship with respect to each other.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 5, 7, and 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As described below, Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitations of allowable Claim 5 and intervening Claim 2. Additionally, Claims 7 and 8 have been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of their base Claim and intervening Claims.

Withdrawn Claims 12-20

Claims 12-20 were withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner in the Office Action of 24 September 2003. Applicants submitted arguments traversing the

Appl. No. 10/085,669

withdrawal from consideration of Claims 12-20 in a response filed 04 November 2003. The Examiner has since maintained the position that these Claims are withdrawn from consideration.

By this amendment, to put the application in condition for allowance, withdrawn Claims 12-20 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants may pursue divisional or continuation applications that are filed so as to be co-pending with this application.

Rejections under 35 USC 102(e)

Claims 1-3 and 9-11 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamamoto, et al., (US Patent 6,236,366).

Claims 2 and 10-11 have been cancelled, and, in view thereof, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of these Claims has been rendered moot.

With respect to Claims 1 and 3, Applicants note that Claim 1 has been rewritten to include the limitations of allowable Claim 5 and intervening Claim 2. In view of this amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 1 has been overcome, and that the rejection of Claim 3, which depends from amended Claim 1, has also been overcome.

With respect to Claim 9, Applicants note that Claim 9 depends from amended Claim 8. Further, Claim 8, which the Examiner has indicated to be allowable, has been rewritten in independent form including the limitations of its base and intervening Claims. In view of this amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 9 has been overcome.

Rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Yamamoto, et al., as applied in the rejection under 35 USC 102(e), and further in view of Nagata, et al.

With respect to Claims 4 and 6, Applicants note that these Claims depend indirectly from amended Claim 1, and that Claim 1 has been amended to recite the

Appl. No. 10/085,669

limitations of allowable Claim 5 and intervening Claim 2. In view of this amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 4 and 6 have been overcome.

New Claims 21-25

New Claims 21-23 depend from amended Claim 1, which has been amended to recite the limitations of allowable Claim 5 and intervening Claim 2. Claim 21 includes the limitations that were previously recited in Claim 11. Claim 22 recites that at least a portion of the shield and of the antenna are exposed to air so as to provide for the removal of heat from the module. Support for this can be found in the specification at page 3, lines 10-12. Claim 23 recites that the support is connected by an electrically conductive glue. Support for this can be found in the specification at page 3, lines 16-18. Claims 24 and 25 depend, respectively, from amended Claims 7 and 8, which were indicated to be allowable and have been rewritten to include the limitations of their base and intervening Claims.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that new Claims 21-25 are allowable over the art of record.

Conclusion

All of the objections and rejections in the Office Action of 25 March 2004 have been responded to, and Applicant respectfully submits that the pending Claims 1, 3-4, 6-9, and 21-25 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Raymond J. Werner
Reg. No. 34,752

Dated: 24 June 2004
Portland, Oregon